

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1. This sheet, which includes FIGs. 1 and 2, replaces original sheet 1/2 including FIGs. 1 and 2. In FIG. 1 a label “Prior Art” is added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/2
 Annotated Sheet 1/2 showing changes

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Objection to the Drawings

In response to the objection to figure 1, Applicant has submitted new drawings.

Rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0018571 (Anderson) in view of US 5,790,885 (Shona)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-8.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Anderson and Shona does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1 and 6. For example, independent claims 1 and 6 recite “wherein the driver application operates to communicate key command information to the KVL without the use of a timer peripheral and enables *the UART peripheral to utilize parity error information to validate communication with the KVL*,” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Anderson and Shona.

Applicant agrees with the statement in item 6, page 3 of the Office Action dated March 31, 2010 that “Regarding claim 1 Anderson does not disclose wherein the driver application operates to communicate key command information to the KVL without the use of a timer peripheral and enables the UART peripheral to utilize parity error information to validate communication with the KVL.” However, the Office Action appears to rely on Shona for Applicant’s such feature. The Office Action specifically refers to col. 5, lines 21-38 of Shona as describing Applicant’s claim describing *enabling the UART peripheral to utilize parity error information to validate communication with the KVL*. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Shona in col. 5, lines 21-38 describes “That is, the IC card 70 generates a parity bit from the data of the character output from the IC card reader/writer 40, and collates the thus generated parity bit with a parity bit which is output from the IC card reader/writer 40. As a result of collation, if both parity bits are matched with each other, the controller 42 judges that the transmission data is not abnormal.... Such a status is called as a framing error non-present status, which means that the character output from the IC card reader/writer 40 is normally transmitted to the IC card 70. If both parity bits are not matched with each other as a result of collation, the

controller 42 judges that the transmission data is abnormal (the parity error is generated), whereby the IC card 70 outputs 'L' level during the guard time." The Office Action appears to equate Applicant's "utilizing parity error information to validate communication with the KVL" to Shona's "checking for a framing error based on the parity bits". However, Applicant respectfully asserts that this is a mischaracterization. Shona at best describes checking for an error free transmission between an IC card reader/writer and an IC card. In other words, Shona's system checks whether there is any error in the data transmitted between the IC card reader/writer and the IC card. However, Shona nowhere describes a key variable loader (KVL) and validating a communication with the KVL. Applicant finds support from page 1, lines 25-27 of the specification that the KVL "...is used to generate encryption keys and to communicate with a universal crypto module (UCM) located within the radio for the purpose of transferring encryption keys to the UCM." In general the IC cards do not generate any key. Therefore, Shona's IC card cannot be equated to Applicant's KVL.

Therefore the Office Action specifically referring to Shona's "checking for a framing error based on the parity bits" as describing or being analogous to Applicant's independent claims 1 and 6 reciting "*enables[ing] the UART peripheral to utilize parity error information to validate communication with the KVL,*" is a mischaracterization.

Dependent claims 2-5 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Dependent claims 7-8 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8 are in proper condition for allowance and requests that claims 2-5 and 7-8 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated US 2002/0018571 (Anderson)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-13.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not anticipate each and every claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 9. For example, independent claim 9 recites "*transmitting a fourth detection signal from the UART to a KVL link layer application for sending subsequent data until all data has been transmitted by the UART,*" which are not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Anderson.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 8, page 7 of the Office Action that “Regarding claim 9, Anderson discloses ...transmitting a fourth detection signal from the UART to a KVL link layer application for sending subsequent data until all data has been transmitted by the UART.” The Office Action specifically refers to paragraphs [0062], [0063], and [0084] of Anderson as describing Applicant’s such feature.

Applicant presumes that the Office Action is actually referring to paragraphs [0082], [0083], and [0084] of Anderson as describing Applicant’s such feature. Anderson in paragraphs [0082]-[0084] describes a sequence of request and response frames between the KVL and the target device. Further, Anderson describes a transfer complete signal from the KVL to the target device or from the target device to the KVL upon completion of data transfer. However, Anderson is silent regarding a fourth detection signal from the target to the KVL for sending subsequent data. Therefore, Anderson does not disclose “*transmitting a fourth detection signal from the UART to a KVL link layer application for sending subsequent data until all data has been transmitted by the UART,*” as recited by Applicant’s independent claim 9.

Dependent claims 10-13 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the dependent claims 10-13 are in proper condition for allowance and requests that claims 10-13 may now be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

June 23, 2010
Motorola, Inc.
1303 E. Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 39505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 847-576-3750
E-Mail: docketing.us@motorola.com